

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-2 and 4-10 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 6-8 and 10 have been amended. Claims 3 and 5 have been canceled. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1-2 and 4-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by **Obradovich** (previously applied).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As stated in Applicants' response of December 21, 2005, **Obradovich** discloses a location tagged data provision and display system. A personal communication device (PCD) with electromagnetic communication capability has a GPS receiver and a display. The PCD requests maps and location tagged data from data providers and others for display on the PCD. The data providers respond to requests by using searching and sorting schemes to interrogate data bases and then automatically transmit data responsive to the requests to the requesting PCD.

Column 23, lines 37-44 disclose:

The image taken using the PCD camera, along with the appropriate GPS stamp, is provided by the cellular communication capability, included with the device, to a central computer storage system. The central computer storage system then makes the CRD device data available, in the manner as previously described, to those requesting condition reporting device data.

Based on this disclosure in **Obradovich**, the GPS stamp and image are only provided to the central computer storage system, and the GPS stamp and image are not transmitted to a communication terminal device having inputted identifying information. Accordingly, a user carrying the PCD cannot notify a party whom the user is scheduled to meet of the present

location of the user. The party needs to request data from the central computer storage system to ascertain the present location of the user.

Claim 1 recites that a person viewing the communication terminal device (not the central computer storage system of **Obradovich**) may determine a location of a user (sender) of the portable communication device.

The Examiner urges that column 8, lines 46-54 disclose:

a universal converter, which reads on claimed “transmitting means” for converting the location information detected by the location detection means to a radio signal and transmitting the radio signal to the communication terminal device having the inputted identifying information (see columns 24 and 8 lines 7-12 lines 46-54).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Column 8, lines 46-54 disclose:

As illustrated in FIG. 29, the universal converter enables the PCD to read in data provided by third parties 291a, b and convert or filter such data to a format useable by the PCD. The universal converter first inspects the received data to determine if the data is in a known format which can be converted to the format used by the PCD. If the format is not known by the device, the universal converter attempts to extract any ASCII data or format the data as a bit map as appropriate.

Column 24, lines 7-12, also cited by the Examiner to support this proposition, disclose:

The particular local geographic locations are based on the locations of cell sites for cellular telephone networks, and the location specific data is transmitted by a cell site 1332 both over a standard radio broadcast system using a radio transmitter 1334 and by request to the cell site via a telephone access number. This data includes ASCII or other text formats, digital graphical images, including maps, digital photo-based images, and audio-data.

There is no disclosure in **Obradovich** that the “digital photo-based images” are taken by the image pickup device at the location of the user. These images are part of data 1330

“pertaining to a local geographic area [are] maintained by cellular telephone system providers or other entities,” as disclosed in column 24, lines 5-7. Thus, these “digital photo-based images” do not constitute “image data obtained for photography by the image pickup device,” as recited in claim 1 and, in similar language, for one display recited in claim 10, as amended.

The undersigned conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner on July 18, 2006.

In the interview, the proposed amendment to claim 10 was presented and the patentability of claims 1, 2 and 4-10 was argued.

In response to these arguments, the Examiner recommended that both claims 1 and 10 be amended to clarify that the image pickup device takes image photographs at a location of a user, and he also recommended that the limitations of claim 5 be added to claim 1, and a total of two or more displays be claimed. He indicated that such amendments, as attached hereto, would overcome the § 102(e) rejection based on **Obradovich**.

Accordingly, the claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-2 and 4-10, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants’ undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,  
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



William L. Brooks  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak  
Atty. Docket No. **011728**  
Suite 1000  
1725 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 659-2930



**23850**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time  
Check in the amount of \$120.00

Q:\HOME\AKERR\WLB\01\011728\amendment af aug 2006